

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 621

SP 018 878

AUTHOR Natriello, Gary; Dornbusch, Sanford M.
TITLE Providing Direction and Building Commitment: A Study of Teacher Standards and Warmth.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April, 1980).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Standards; *Discipline; Interpersonal Competence; *Leadership Qualities; Secondary Education; Student Motivation; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

Two studies examined the incidence of and the relationship between teacher enforcement of school standards and their warmth in responding to typical classroom problems. In the first questionnaire, the problems posed were those of hypothetical students. In the second questionnaire, the problems were applied to students in the teachers' classes. The "hypothetical" study involved 156 teachers in 14 high schools. The "role book" study involved 168 teachers in 18 high schools. Results suggest that while teachers may enforce standards in a warm and caring way, empirically this combination seems to be a rare event. Teachers were more likely to present standards than warmth. Literature on teaching as a form of leadership indicates that both firm adherence to standards and personal warmth are components of effective leadership. It is suggested that teachers may not be engaging in optimal leadership behaviors to provide direction for students and to build commitment among them. (Author/JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED206621

PROVIDING DIRECTION AND BUILDING COMMITMENT:

A STUDY OF TEACHER STANDARDS AND WARMTH

Gary Natriello, Washington University

Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GARY NATRIELLO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the

American Educational Research Association

Boston, Massachusetts

April, 1980

SP 018 878

PROVIDING DIRECTION AND BUILDING COMMITMENT:

A STUDY OF TEACHER STANDARDS AND WARMTH

Gary Natriello, Washington University

Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University

Problems in the Study of Teaching Effectiveness

The study of teaching effectiveness has long been hampered by the lack of systematic theory to guide research efforts. The literature on teacher effects on student learning has few theoretical grounds to guide the selection of meaningful variables or the integration of available findings (Cruickshank, 1976; Doyle, 1978). In the absence of a theory of teaching effectiveness the selection of teacher behavior variables becomes problematic. The teaching effectiveness literature has attempted without much success to deal with this problem by considering an incredibly broad range of teacher behavior variables (Rosenshine and Furst, 1973). Thus despite the large number of studies of teaching behavior, Rosenshine has pointed out that as of 1976, fewer than 25 studies had been conducted on any specific variable of teaching behavior. It is not surprising that progress in the study of teaching has been slower than many of us would like.

In response to such problems in the teaching effectiveness literature a number of investigators have decided to concentrate on more restricted instructional settings (Snow, 1977; Good, Ebmeier, and Becherman, 1978), while others have devoted their efforts to the collection of data from a large number of similar settings in the hope that certain patterns will become apparent (Berliner, 1975). Some investigators even seem to be on the way to identifying recurring patterns of effective teaching (Rosen-shine and Meyers, 1978), at least for limited instructional conditions.

Our own approach has been somewhat different. We have broadened our perspective on teaching beyond the classroom and made it more specific by examining the nature

of teaching and learning tasks. We have become convinced that the most useful approach to the study of teaching effectiveness will be one which explicitly treats both teachers and students as members of the larger school organization and one which pays explicit attention to theoretically distinct tasks in the classroom.

Teaching as Institutional Leadership

Adopting an approach first used by Waller (1932), we conceive of teaching as institutional leadership. Waller's approach was quite different from those adopted by recent investigators of teacher effects because, in addition to considering the social-psychological dimensions of teacher-student interaction in classrooms, he also paid explicit attention to the organization of schools and the roles of teacher and student as defined by the organization. Thus he provides us with a way to conceive of the constraints which shape the behavior of teachers and students.

The history of the study of leadership in institutions or organizations is at least as long and perhaps even less rewarding than the study of teaching effectiveness (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Perrow, 1979). Before we present the details of our approach to the study of teaching as institutional leadership, it would be useful to review the problems with the literature on leadership in institutions. Fortunately, for our purposes, we can follow this literature as it has developed in the study of educational institutions through studies of teachers as leaders of groups of students. More general reviews of the leadership literature (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Natriello, 1979) indicate that the same problems characterize studies of leadership in other organizations.

The study of leadership in the classroom has been hampered by four related problems. First, there has been a great deal of conceptual confusion about the dimensions of teacher behavior to be examined. Different investigators have used a variety of variables such as authoritarian-democratic (Lewin, Lippitt and White, 1939), domineering-integrative (H.H. Anderson, 1943), initiating structure-consideration (Hemphill,

1957; L. M. Smith 1960), directiveness-warmth (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974), task oriented-supportive (Cruickshank, 1976), and teacher structuring-praise (Soar and Soar, 1976). The lack of consistent definitions and the lack of adequately specified concepts has impeded the development of this line of research.

Lack of clarity in conceptualization has led to a second problem with this literature, the tendency to treat two distinct dimensions or variables as opposite poles of a single continuum. Commenting on the Lewin, Anderson, and Withall studies, Smith and Hudgins noted that:

These studies seem to interwine at least two major concepts. First, there is a dimension of teacher-pupil relationship involving sentiment, the liking of the pupils. Teacher attitudes and behavior in working with a group can vary from very accepting, warm, and friendly to very rejecting, cold, and unfriendly A second idea receiving varying emphasis in the above studies is the directiveness or non-directiveness of the teacher or leader in interaction with the children. Logically, this dimension seems independent of sentiment. (1967:216-217)

Dunkin and Biddle (1974) observed that the confusion between these two dimensions appeared in the ideology of the progressive education movement as well as in studies of group dynamics. In both cases writers suggested a negative correlation between sentiment and directiveness.

The tendency to view these dimensions of leadership or teaching behavior as opposite poles of the same continuum has led to two additional problems in the literature. Researchers attached values to these two polar positions and focused their investigations on one or the other. Review of the literature on what he referred to as the "authoritarian-democratic studies," Anderson (1959) pointed out that the original pair of terms (authoritarian and democratic) contained an inherent moralism which had been transferred to other pairs of analogous terms even though these newer terms had been introduced in an effort to be more objective. Thus implicit throughout this literature is the notion that democratic, integrative, learner-centered, considerate, warm, supportive, and praising environments should be preferred over those that are authoritarian, dominative, teacher-centered, initiating, directive, task-oriented and structured.

Cronbach pointed out that the moralistic interpretation of leadership inherent in the concepts used by various researchers even affected the actual work of the studies:

When teacher-control was branded as "autocracy" and contrasted with so-called "democratic" teaching, all the research seemed to be trying to prove that teacher control cannot possibly work. These studies are usually made by training some leaders to use each particular style of leadership so that different styles can be compared. Almost without exception, the dominative leaders are taught to be harsh, to use hostile comments in criticizing students, and to discourage student initiative. (1954:455-456)

This general observation is confirmed in a specific case in McCandless's assessment of the behavior of the group leaders in the Lewin, Lippit, and White experiments:

The four leaders were graduate students or post doctoral fellows in child and clinical psychology. All were convinced and liberal equalitarians, living at a time when Hitler, the arch-authoritarian, was consolidating his power and preparing for world conquest. Each preferred and put his heart into his democratic leadership role, becoming perhaps the warmest, and most dedicated democratic leader in recent history. But when his turn came to play the authoritarian, he tended to become cold and hard, a veritable Captain Bligh. (1967:564)

McCandless's comments in reinterpreting Lewin, Lippit, and White to distinguish between directiveness and warmth point up another problem in this literature, one that also resulted from the tendency to conceive of directiveness and sentiment as dichotomous values on a single continuum. The problem is that investigators have focused on either directiveness or warmth without examining the possible interaction effects. In 1954 Cronbach noted that "we lack research on friendly, adaptable, teacher control, which is the pattern most teachers are presently trying to use." Twenty years later, Dunkin and Biddle (1974) indicated that we still had little knowledge of such teaching. Katz and Kahn (1978) indicate that it is possible to find ample support for the thesis that both socio-emotional and task leadership are necessary for effective organizational functioning, though they too note that this thesis has not often guided research efforts.

Given the problems with the literature on teacher leadership, it is not surprising that it has produced no clear results. In his 1959 review, Anderson cited

eleven studies which supported greater learning for learner-centered groups, thirteen studies which showed no difference, and eight which found teacher-centered methods superior to learner-centered methods. In 1974, Dunkin and Biddle listed twenty studies which showed no relationship between teacher indirectness and student achievement and twelve studies which showed that greater teacher indirectness was related to greater pupil achievement. The evidence they cited for the effects of teacher warmth and directiveness on student achievement was very limited and showed mixed results. Thus we are left with what seems to be a fruitless line of research.

However, we would like to suggest that with a few modifications, the consideration of teaching as institutional leadership may yet prove to be a useful way to examine teaching effectiveness. These modifications will include the development of a truly organizational or institutional perspective on teaching and teacher-student interaction as well as an explicit consideration of teacher and student tasks in schools.

The literature on teacher leadership has not really followed Waller's approach of considering the roles of teachers and students in school organizations. Conceptions of leadership in this literature have more closely resembled what Waller referred to as "personal leadership" (1932) which he saw as arising from the interaction of personalities. In contrast, Waller noted that:

Institutionalized leadership gains by a clear demarcation of boundary lines and by rigid adherence to them. Personal influence must always be strained through the sieve of formality. Institutional leadership cannot remain institutional save by an insistence upon the lines of demarcation, for there is always a tendency for the human interaction in a situation to transcend these boundary lines. (1932:190)

The lines of demarcation in schools are explicitly mentioned by Bidwell (1965) in his review of the literature on the school as an organization. He notes, "that the role structure of a school system contains a fundamental dichotomy between student and staff roles." and proceeds to point to several features of educational in-

stitutions which have implications for teaching effectiveness. Bidwell observes that the student role is a recruitment role and that:

Young persons are compelled to enter school systems as students simply because of their placement in certain age grades, without reference to specific performances. Furthermore, since students are to be socialized into adult life, the central activities of this role are not directly relevant to the immediate interests or lives of its incumbents. (1965:973)

Starting with these assumptions--assumptions which take into account the nature of the school as an organization--Bidwell goes on to discuss two dimensions of teacher behavior in dealing with students. First, he notes that in order to produce a uniform product, schools and teachers engage in the "universalistic and thus uniform assessment of student accomplishment." Thus teachers present institutional standards to students and evaluate their performance in terms of those standards.

However, presenting standards to students and demanding their compliance may not be enough to promote learning in view of the fact that students may not see schools as relevant to their immediate interests. Bidwell notes this while reviewing the contribution of Waller to the study of schools:

Motivation to learn, he said, is very largely a product of a close, warm relation between teacher and student. Compliance may produce little intrinsic learning and a good deal of internal resistance among students. (Bidwell, 1965:979)

Thus Bidwell suggests that teaching behavior consists of instances of universalistic assessment as well as instances of more diffuse responsiveness. Further, he points out that these behaviors may be perceived as conflicting. This is consistent with the treatment of such variables in the literature on teaching as classroom leadership. However, we will follow Smith and Hudgins (1967) and treat them as logically independent aspects of teaching behavior.

We assume that to promote student learning, teachers must engage in both of these behaviors, that is, they must both provide direction and build commitment, or as we put it later--present standards and warmth. This assumption, however, depends upon the context within which teaching occurs. At this point we can specify at least

two aspects of the context which appear to be important for our basic assumption about teaching effectiveness: the conditions of student membership or affiliation with the school and the nature of the teaching and learning tasks.

Several theorists have noted the effects of the conditions under which students become affiliated with schools on student commitment or motivation. Carlson (1964) observed that both the extent to which organizations control admission to membership and the extent to which clients exercise control over their participation in an organization have an effect on the commitment of members. Organizations such as public schools in which neither the organization nor the client has a choice regarding affiliation, face the most severe problems of client commitment. Nault (1977) found that self-affiliated students demonstrated greater commitment to school than classmates who were compelled to participate. Bidwell (1970) cites the involuntary affiliation of students with schools together with the batch processing of students, and the affectivity-based techniques and limited reputations of teachers as part of the organizational context of public schools which makes the development of trust or commitment problematic.

Two conclusions emerge from this work. First, the need to attend to problems of commitment among students will vary depending upon the conditions of affiliation. School organizations where students are self-affiliated will need to attend to such problems less than those where student membership is compulsory. Second, since students in public schools are compelled to attend, effective teaching in such schools will involve building commitment among students.

The second aspect of the organizational context which appears to be important in considering teaching effectiveness is the nature of the teaching and learning tasks. In recent years there has been a growing realization that the nature of tasks is important for group interaction and leadership (Hackman, 1969). Dornbusch and Scott (1975) have demonstrated the importance of the nature of tasks for supervision and evaluation in a variety of organizations and have documented how individuals

in any given position in an organization may be performing several theoretically distinct tasks. Bossert (1977) reported that the task organization of the classroom greatly influenced the types of direction and supervision provided by teachers. Cohen, Intili and Robbins (1979) argued that supervision is a function of task complexity.

This work carries several implications for studies of effective teaching. First, the roles of teacher and student in public school organizations each typically involve the performance of what are rather theoretically different tasks. Second, the appropriate provision of direction for students in the performance of those tasks will vary depending on the nature of the task; routine tasks will require different teacher behavior than those that are low in efficacy or complex (high in uncertainty).

Studies of teaching effectiveness can be designed to consider both the impact of the conditions of student affiliation and the nature of teaching and learning tasks. For example, natural variation in teacher behavior can be studied across school organizations where the conditions of student affiliation vary as in public and private schools, in high schools and colleges, or in required and elective courses. Studies can also be designed that are sensitive to the nature of tasks, not in terms of subject matter as has been done in the past, but in terms of the uncertainty associated with the variety of tasks within and among subject areas.

In preparation for such work, we have designed the present studies to examine teaching behaviors which contribute to the provision of direction and the building of commitment. In the present study we have specified these dimensions of teaching behavior as:

- a) The extent to which teachers present school standards for performance; and
- b) The extent to which teachers are warm and friendly to students.

To examine the incidence of these teaching behaviors, we created studies in which both the conditions of student affiliation and the nature of teaching and learning tasks were controlled. We controlled the conditions of affiliation by conducting our study in public high schools and we controlled the nature of the tasks involved

by focusing on a standard set of tasks. The studies allow us to test the utility of our conceptions of teaching behavior and to examine the distributions of these behaviors as well as the nature of the relationship between these behaviors.

Procedures

We designed two studies to enable us to examine the distributions of teacher standards and warmth. In both studies we involved teachers in public secondary schools. In this way we were able to control for the effects of conditions of student affiliation on teaching. We also controlled the nature of the teaching and learning tasks in both studies.

Both studies required teachers to complete questionnaires designed to determine how they handle typical classroom problems. In the questionnaire teachers were presented with typical classroom problems of two types--student failures to conform to the academic achievement norms of the school and student failures to conform to the social behavior norms of the school. Sixteen different classroom problems, eight involving failure to conform to academic achievement norms (e.g., You see that a student in your class is not handing in homework assignments.) and eight involving failure to conform to social behavior norms (e.g., You note that a student in your class is being belligerent and aggressive toward other students.) were developed in consultation with a group of classroom teachers. These problems were randomly ordered, and their position on the questionnaires was systematically rotated.

Elsewhere (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a), we have discussed in detail the theoretically relevant differences between academic tasks and social behavior tasks. Basically, we argue that teachers conceive of academic tasks as what Dornbusch and Scott (1975) have referred to as active tasks, that is, as tasks that are low in efficacy or high in uncertainty. Furthermore, they tend to conceive of social behavior tasks as what Dornbusch and Scott have termed inert tasks, that is tasks that are high in efficacy or low in uncertainty. As a result of these differences in task conceptions we expect effective teaching to vary by type of task.

The same set of student problems was used in both questionnaires. In one form of the questionnaire, which we called the hypothetical student study, teachers were presented with a hypothetical profile of a student involved in each problem. The profile contained information on the student's ethnicity, sex, academic achievement record, and social behavior record. Earlier reports on this research have examined differences in teacher behavior toward students with different characteristics (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979; Natriello, 1979a). After reading the classroom problem and the student profile, teachers were asked to explain how they would respond to the problem. Teacher replies were scored according to the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and/or warmth.

In the second form of the questionnaire, which we called the roll book student study, teachers were again presented with typical classroom problems and asked how they would respond. This time the teachers were not provided with student profiles. Instead, they were asked to select students at random from their roll books and to associate each with a specific classroom problem selected at random. Thus teachers were asked how they would respond if each student selected at random from their roll books failed to conform to a randomly selected school norm. At the end of the questionnaire, teachers were asked to supply information on the status characteristics of each student. As with the first questionnaire, teacher responses were scored according to the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and/or warmth.

We developed two different studies that would provide comparable data and that would complement each other. The hypothetical student study provides us with systematic data on the independent effects of the student characteristics; while the role book student study has the advantage of allowing us to get closer to the actual classrooms of the teachers by asking them to react to students from their own classes. By using both techniques to study teacher behavior we can have increased faith in those findings supported by both studies.

However, it is important to note here that while using questionnaires to collect data on teacher classroom behavior has many advantages, such as allowing us to control the nature of teaching and learning tasks being studied, it also has the major disadvantage of not directly observing classroom behavior. Teachers will, no doubt, respond differently to the hypothetical problems presented in the questionnaires than they would to actual problems presented in the classroom for two reasons. First, they have the time to reflect on their responses to the questionnaires. Second, they are presenting their ideas to an outside audience. This means that the responses to the questionnaires do not provide a substitute for classroom behavior, but rather ideas (and perhaps an ideology) linked to it.

In both studies teachers were asked to provide open-ended responses to the classroom problems. Their responses were coded in terms of the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and the extent to which they evidenced warmth. We adopted the following multiple value coding systems for two dimensions:

<u>Standards</u>	<u>Warmth</u>
0 = No Evidence of Standards	0 = No Personal Concern
1 = Implicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-making	1 = Implicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-making
2 = Implicit Standards Communicated to the Student	2 = Explicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-making
3 = Explicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-making	3 = Implicit Personal Concern Communicated to the Student
4 = Explicit Standards Communicated to the Student	4 = Explicit Personal Concern Communicated to the Student

Results

The hypothetical student study involved 156 teachers in 14 schools, each teacher responding to 16 classroom problems associated with hypothetical student profiles, a total of 2,469 individual responses. The roll book student study involved 168 teachers in 18 schools responding to eight classroom problems which they associated

with students from their own roll books, a total of 1,344 responses. The data have been analyzed from a number of different perspectives. Earlier papers have discussed relative differences in teacher responses to student behavior and characteristics individually (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979), differences in teacher responses to behavior and academic problems (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a), and the stratification of socialization processes in the classroom (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980b).

In this paper we limit our analysis to the distribution of teacher standards and warmth and the relationship between these dimensions of behavior in the two studies. Table 1 presents the distributions of teacher responses scored for standards in the two studies, while Table 2 presents the distributions of teacher responses scored for warmth.

The coding system for standards results in a distribution of scores across categories with concentrations at (2) Implicit Standards Communicated (49% in the hypothetical student study and 28.7% in the roll book student study). The coding system for warmth results in a distribution of scores across the categories with concentrations at (0) No Concern (49% in the hypothetical student study and 39.3% in the roll book student study); and at (1) Implicit Concern in Decision-making (28.1% in the hypothetical student study and 41.0% in the roll book student study).

It is clear that teachers are far more likely to use standards than they are to use warmth in responding to classroom problems. It is true, of course, that teachers show no warmth 47.2% of the time in the hypothetical student study and 39.3% of the time in the roll book student study, but what is most striking is the fact that teachers feel warmth in a great many cases without communicating it to their students. In the hypothetical student study, teachers evidence warmth (1) Implicit Personal Concern in Decision-making, and (2) Explicit Personal Concern in Decision-making) in their decision making without communicating it in 41.7% of all their responses. The majority of teacher responses to the roll book student study (55.3%)

TABLE 1

Distribution of Teacher Responses Scored
for Standards in the Two Studies

Standards*	Hypothetical Student Study	Roll Book Student Study
No Evidence	96 (4.0%)	71 (5.5%)
Implicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-making	161 (6.6%)	80 (1.1%)
Implicit Standards Communicated to the Student	1,195 (49.2%)	686 (52.1%)
Explicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-making	132 (7.5%)	91 (7.0%)
Explicit Standards Communicated	795 (32.7%)	374 (28.7%)
	N = 2,429	N = 1,302

TABLE 2

Distribution of Teacher Responses Scored
for Warmth in the Two Studies

Warmth *	Hypothetical Student Study	Roll Book Student Study
No Personal Concern	1,197 (49.2%)	515 (39.3%)
Implicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-making	684 (28.1%)	539 (41.0%)
Explicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-making	331 (13.6%)	137 (14.3%)
Implicit Personal Concern Communi- cated to the Student	177 (7.3%)	56 (4.3%)
Explicit Personal Concern Communi-	43 (1.8%)	15 (1.1%)
	N = 2,432	N = 1,311

* In both coding systems each higher value was posted to meet the requirements of the lower values. In coding for standards the coded value "3" (Explicit Standards in Decision-making) was assumed to be greater than the coded value "2" (Implicit Standards Communicated) because in reading the teacher responses, we found that teachers always communicated standards at least implicitly whenever they referred to an explicit standard in their decision-making process. Unlike the case of standards, explicit concern that was communicated was generally at least explicit in the teacher's decision-making process. Thus "Explicit Personal Concern in Decision-making" was coded "2", while "Implicit Personal Concern Communicated" was coded as "3".

fell in these two categories. Thus, in general, teachers in both studies were more likely to communicate those standards to their students than to communicate warmth.

To determine the relationship between teacher presentations of standards and teacher presentations of warmth the individual teacher responses (2,496 in the hypothetical student study and 1,344 in the roll book student study) were examined. In this analysis we present only measures of association since teacher responses to individual problems do not represent independent observations. Since these variables are ordinal, we used gamma as our measure of association.

There was a negative relationship between the two variables in both the hypothetical student study where $\gamma = -.22$, and in the roll book student study where $\gamma = -.26$. Thus teachers in the studies tend not to employ standards and warmth simultaneously.

However, there seems to be nothing inherent in the nature of the two variables which makes the simultaneous expression of standards and warmth impossible. We did note some teacher responses to classroom problems that incorporated both the presentation of standards and the presentation of warmth. For example, one teacher in the roll book study responding to a student who kept coming in late to class, wrote:

REMIND THE STUDENT THAT CLASS BEGINS AT 8:00. ENQUIRE ABOUT REASONS FOR ARRIVING LATE--OFFER TO ASSIST IN SOLVING PROBLEMS CAUSING LATE ARRIVAL.

THIS STUDENT LIVES 15-20 MILES FROM CAMPUS--HAS TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS--READS AT SECOND GRADE LEVEL AND DESPARATELY NEEDS TO BE IN SCHOOL APPLYING HIMSELF TO REMEDIAL WORK.

Another teacher in the hypothetical student study, responded with both standards and warmth to the student who made sarcastic comments and disturbed her while she was talking to the class:

I'D IGNORE HIM AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE UNTIL I COULD GET TO HIM PRIVATELY. TALK ABOUT HOW IT DISTURBS ME--OFFER HIM SPECIAL HELP. ASSURE HIM HE CAN DO BETTER--IS REALLY A NEAT KID, ETC.

Thus while responses of this type were rare in the two studies, some teachers did find it possible to incorporate both standards and warmth in response to classroom

problems presented by students. While this pattern of teacher behavior may be difficult, it is certainly not impossible to attain.

Discussion

The finding that teachers in both studies were more likely to present standards than warmth is not surprising in view of the fact that in all cases the teachers were responding to problematic student behavior. However, the tendency for teachers not to communicate warmth that enters into their decision-making is noteworthy for it may indicate a reluctance or an inability to accurately communicate to students the basis for decisions made in response to classroom problems. Certainly this phenomenon contributes to the more general finding of a negative relationship between teacher presentations of standards and teacher presentations of warmth.

This negative relationship between standards and warmth suggests that earlier investigators who conceived of the two aspects of teacher behavior as opposite poles of a single continuum or as mutually exclusive types of behavior were reflecting what in many cases is real in terms of teacher behavior. But it is also possible that teachers learn that ideology, so cause and effect cannot be unscrambled.

Teachers do tend to refrain from being warm when they present standards. However, it is possible for teachers to present both standards and warmth, that is, to both provide direction for students and to build commitment among them. At this point while we have begun to suggest features of school organization (mode of student affiliation and the nature of teaching and learning tasks) which may determine the extent to which the building of commitment and the provision of direction will be necessary aspects of effective teaching, we have few clues as to what aspects of school organization will facilitate or encourage teacher behaviors along either line. Future research might examine the barriers to such teacher behavior in both individual teacher-student interactions and in situations where the teacher is confronted with an entire class.

Conclusion

Results from the two studies suggest that while teacher standards and warmth may be employed together by teachers, empirically this combination seems to be a rare event. Since the literature on teaching as institutional leadership and the more general literature on leadership indicates that under certain conditions both of these behaviors are important components of effective leadership, studies should consider both those aspects of the school organization that affect the need for direction and commitment as well as those organizational features which facilitate or encourage teaching behavior to address such needs.

References

- Anderson, H. H., "Domination and Socially Integrative Behavior," in R. Barkes, et. al. eds. Child Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1943.
- Anderson, Richard C., "Learning in Discussions: A Resume of the Authoritarian-Democratic Studies," Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, p.159.
- Berliner, David C., "Mandated Competency-Based Teacher Certification and the Public Interest," Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Meetings, Washington, DC, 1975.
- Bidwell, Charles E., "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. G. March, ed., The Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965. pp. 972-1022.
- Bidwell, Charles E., "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client-Serving Organizations," in W. R. Rosengren and M. Lefton, eds., Organizations and Clients. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1970, pp. 37-70
- Bossert, Steven T., "Tasks, Group Management, and Teacher Control Behavior: A Study of Classroom Organization and Teacher Style," School Review, August, 1977, pp. 552-565.
- Carlson, R. O., "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and its Clients," in D. E. Griffiths, ed., Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 262-276.
- Cohen, Elizabeth G., Jo-Ann K. Intili and Susan H. Robbins, "Task and Authority: A Sociological View of Classroom Management," in D. L. Duke, ed., Classroom Management. Seventy-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979, pp. 116-143.
- Cronbach, L. J., Educational Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1954.
- Cruickshank, Donald R., "Synthesis of Selected Recent Research on Teacher Effects," Journal of Teacher Education. Spring 1976, pp. 57-60.
- Dornbusch, Sanford M. and W. R. Scott, Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.
- Doyle, Walter, "Paradigms for Research on Teacher Effectiveness," in L. S. Shullman, ed., Review of Research on Teacher Effectiveness, 1977. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1978.
- Dunkin, B. and M. Biddle, The Study of Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.
- Good, T. L., H. Ebmeier, and T. Beckerman, "Teaching Mathematics in High and Low Classrooms: An Empirical Comparison," Journal of Teacher Education. September-October, 1978, pp. 85-90.
- Hackman, J. R., "Toward Understanding the Role of Tasks in Behavioral Research," Acta Psychologica 31. 1969, pp. 97-128
- Hemphill, J., "Leader Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputations of College Departments," in R. Stogdill and A. Coons, eds., Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1957.

- Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Lewin, Kurt, R. Lippit and R. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates,'" The Journal of Social Psychology, 10. 1939.
- McCandless, B. R., Children: Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Natriello, G. and S. M. Dornbusch, "Academic Instruction or Behavioral Control: An Experimental Study of Teacher Responses to Classroom Problems. Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston Massachusetts, 1980a.
- Natriello, G. and S. M. Dornbusch, "Bringing Behavior Back in: The Effects of Student Characteristics and Behavior on the Classroom Behavior of Teachers." Unpublished Paper, St. Louis, MO, 1979.
- Natriello, G., "The Effects of Status Characteristics, Performance Characteristics, and Classroom Behavior of Students on Classroom Behavior of Teachers." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Anaheim, CA, 1979a.
- Natriello, G., "Teacher Standards and Teacher Warmth in the Classroom: Toward a Theory of Teaching as Institutional Leadership." Paper Presented at the Seventh Annual Northwest Research and Evaluation Conference, Seattle, WA, 1979b.
- Natriello, G. and S. M. Dornbusch, "The Stratification of Socialization Processes: A View from the Classroom." Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, 1980b.
- Nault, Richard, "The School Commitments of Nonpublic School Freshmen Voluntarily and Involuntarily Affiliated with Their Schools," in D. A. Erickson, ed., Educational Organization and Administration, Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977, pp. 264-295.
- Perrow, Charles, Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1979.
- Rosenshine, Berak, "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement," Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1976, pp. 61-64.
- Rosenshine, Barak and Linda Meyers, "Staff Development for Teaching Basic Skills," Theory into Practice, June 1978, pp. 267-271.
- Smith, L. M., "Pupil Expectations of Teacher Leadership Behavior." Unpublished Final Report, U.S.O.E. Cooperative Research Project, 1960.
- Smith, L. M. and B. Hudgins, Educational Psychology: An Application of Social and Behavioral Theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- Snow, Richard E., "Individual Differences and Instructional Theory," Educational Researcher, November 1977, pp. 11-15.
- Soar, R. S. and R. M. Soar, "An Attempt to Identify Measures of Teacher Effectiveness from Four Studies. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1976.
- Waller, Willard, The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932.
- Withall, H. H., "The Development of a Technique for the Measurement of Social-Emotional Climate in Classrooms." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1948.